

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

VIVIAN BURNS,

Plaintiff,

v.

INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS
MACHINES CORPORATION,

Defendant.

Case No. C20-1555RSM

ORDER DENYING MOTION TO
APPOINT COUNSEL

This matter comes before the Court on the Motion to Appoint Counsel filed by Plaintiff Vivian Burns. Dkt. #6. Defendant has appeared and filed an Answer. Dkt. #11.

In civil cases, the appointment of counsel to a *pro se* litigant “is a privilege and not a right.” *United States ex. Rel. Gardner v. Madden*, 352 F.2d 792, 793 (9th Cir. 1965) (citation omitted). “Appointment of counsel should be allowed only in exceptional cases.” *Id.* (citing *Weller v. Dickson*, 314 F.2d 598 (9th Cir. 1963)). A court must consider together “both the likelihood of success on the merits and the ability of the petitioner to articulate his claims *pro se* in light of the complexity of the legal issues involved.” *Weygandt v. Look*, 718 F.2d 952, 954 (9th Cir. 1983). In “exceptional circumstances,” a district court may appoint counsel for indigent

1 civil litigants. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1); *Rand v. Rowland*, 113 F.3d 1520, 1525 (9th Cir. 1997),
2 *overruled on other grounds*, 154 F.3d 952 (9th Cir. 1998).

3 Ms. Burns sets forth her efforts to retain an attorney but has failed to set forth exceptional
4 circumstances warranting the appointment of counsel in this case. She has demonstrated
5 sufficient ability to articulate her claims. Given all of the above, this Motion will be denied.
6

7 Having considered Plaintiff's Motion and the remainder of the record, this Motion is
8 DENIED. The Clerk shall send a copy of this Order to Plaintiff at 10605 SE 240TH ST #344
9 KENT, WA 98031.

10 DATED this 21st day of December, 2020.
11
12

13
14 

15 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ
16 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28